



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
P.O. BOX 2675
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17105-2675

Office of Children, Youth & Families
Deputy Secretary's Office

Phone: 717-787-4756
Fax: 717-787-0414

FEB 16 2012

Mr. William T. Simmons, Director
Allegheny County Executive
7150 Highland Drive
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15206

Dear Mr. Ramsey:

RE: Shuman Center
County C&Y Agencies - Secure Detention

License #: 414310

As a result of the Department of Public Welfare's licensing/approval inspection conducted on November 21 and 22, 2011, we have found the above-named facility to be in complete compliance with Title 55, PA Code: Chapter 3800 Regulations. Therefore, a regular certificate of compliance is being issued. Your Certificate of Compliance is enclosed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Beverly Mackereth".

Beverly D. Mackereth
Deputy Secretary

Enclosure

LICENSING/APPROVAL/REGISTRATION INSPECTION SUMMARY

NAME OF AGENCY/FACILITY: Shuman Juvenile Detention Center				TELEPHONE 412-661-6806	OCYF REGIONAL STAFF APPROVAL	DATE
ADDRESS: 7150 Highland Drive, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15206				COUNTY Allegheny		
INSPECTED BY; David Majcher, Wayne McNeill, Amber Kalp, Mark Nuzzo				INSPECTION DATE November 21, 22, 2011	<i>Dave Majcher (PK)</i>	<i>2/6/12</i>
INITIAL INSPECTION	RENEWAL INSPECTION	COMPLAINT	UNANNOUNCED INSPECTION	RANDOM SAMPLE	<i>Michael J. ...</i>	<i>2/6/12</i>
	X				<i>Glenn C. ...</i>	<i>2/7/12</i>

Shuman Center is a secure juvenile detention facility serving delinquent youth from Allegheny County. It consists of 10 units with a capacity of 13 youth on each unit. At the time of this inspection, 64 youth, less than 50% of the maximum capacity, were being detained at the facility. Length of stay was ranging from 1 - 2 weeks, with less than 5% of all committed youth remaining there for more than the 35 day benchmark figure that is utilized for reporting purposes. In terms of length of stay, the Shuman Center compares favorably with other regional and statewide detention centers.

The inspection included the review of 32 child records, and 29 direct care personnel records (21 new hires and 8 experienced employees). Additionally, the files of 3 supervisors were also reviewed. As the result of the review, 2 Clarification Requests were generated in the child files, one regarding an apparently missing psychotropic drug consent form, and the other involving the timeframes of 3 initial health assessments. Both of these requests were satisfactorily addressed by Shuman administration, and no citations resulted. With regard to personnel files, no issues were identified. Clearances and physical exams were present in all cases, and the amount of training, as well as the amount of supervision and support by superiors, exceeded minimum standards.

Twenty formal child interviews, along with a like amount of informal interviews, were conducted. Only 1 of the 20 children interviewed indicated that he had been restrained, and that particular child added that the restraint had taken place during a previous commitment to the facility, and not recently. Additionally, no child felt unsafe at the facility, and for the most part, they felt that staff treated them respectfully. By way of complaints, hard beds, and a lack of activities were most frequently cited.

Ten direct care staff were interviewed. All felt safe in their jobs, and indicated that they were adequately equipped and trained to perform their duties. While all staff acknowledged that times had changed, and that physical management of children had dramatically decreased, not all staff voiced approval. Nearly half stated that they preferred the old way of physically handling youth, rather than the current emphasis on verbal, non-physical interventions coupled with the high degree of staff accountability. Despite their voiced dislike of the changes, staff expressed that they have been able to adapt. The fact that the administration has been able to institute this change, despite resistance, is testament to their effort and commitment. In this regard, the use of cameras and video recording, has proved to be an effective tool both in training and in disciplinary matters.

No major issues were identified during the walk through inspection of the physical plant. It is an older facility, but at this point is reasonably maintained and clean.

1. 55 PA CODE CHAPTER	2. NON-COMPLIANCE AREA	3. CORRECTION REQUIRED	4. REQUIRED CORRECTION DATE	5. PROVIDERS PLAN OF CORRECTION OR RESPONSE	6. STATUS OF CORRECTION
3800	None observed	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Full Approval Recommended

THE LEGAL ENTITY REPRESENTATIVE MUST COMPLETE COLUMN 5, SIGN ON THE SIGNATURE LINE AT THE BOTTOM AND DATE ALL PAGES OF THIS DOCUMENT. RETURN THIS ENTIRE DOCUMENT TO YOUR REGIONAL OFFICE BY:

SIGNATURE OF LEGAL ENTITY REPRESENTATIVE

TITLE

DATE

TELEPHONE NUMBER